DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 153 409 EC 110 358

AUTHOR Jacobs, Ellen
TITLE Teachers Perceptions of the Evaluation Services for Young Children.
PUB DATE May 78
NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at the Annual International Convention, The Council for Exceptional Children (56th, Kansas City, Missouri, May 2-5, 1978, Session W22)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Early Childhood Education; *Identification; *Learning Disabilities; Psychological Services; Questionnaires; *Screening Tests; *Student Evaluation; *Teacher Attitudes; *Testing

ABSTRACT

Evaluated was the extent to which 101 primary grade and preschool Canadian teachers were satisfied with existing screening and testing services for children with possible learning disabilities. Results of the questionnaire indicated that 79% of the teachers believe that testing beyond the assessments carried out in the classroom is a good idea, that in 31.8% of the cases the final decision to test the child rested with the parents; that the most commonly encountered problem expressed by the teachers is the time delay between the request for testing and the actual test administration, that in 61.1% of the cases the examiner's report included recommendations for remedial activities, by that only 27.6% of the teachers felt that the report of the test results helped them to deal more effectively with the child, and that children were easier to work with when the test results had been explained to the parents. Two forms of the questionnaire are appended. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED153409

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Teachers Perceptions of the Evaluation Services for Young Children

Ellen Jacobs

Concordia University

Ellen Jacobs
Assistant Professor
Early Childhood Education
1455 de Maisonneuve
Montreal Quebec

Presented at the Council for Exceptional Children Annual Convention, 1978, Kansas City.

EC110 358

Research in the area of learning disabilities points to the need for early screening and identification of learning problems (De Hirsch, 1966, Koppitz, 1971, Zeitlin, 1977). In the United States individual states have enacted laws for the Education and Early Screening of Handicapped Children (Alaska, Illinois, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Tennessee and Wisconsin) and twenty-seven other states are currently engaged in a variety of Pilot Programs for Kindergarten Screening. Although a number of the provinces in Canada engage in a systematic Kindergarten Screening Program the Province of Quebec however, has no province-wide screening program and therefore individual school consultants use a variety of different screening tools.

The crucial influence of the early childhood years on later success is increasingly evident. The sooner a high risk child is recognized, the greater are the chances of preventing failure. By identifying these children during preschool yers, before they encounter difficulty, it may be possible to diagnose their disabilities and institute remedial education to prevent potential learning problems from occurring (Koegh, 1970, Buktenica, 1971, Lerner, 1971, Denhoft, Hainsworth and Hainsworth, 1972, Koegh and Becker, 1973).

Concern has been expressed as to the potential dangers which might arise from an early identification program. The use of labels which stigmatize children is seen as a problem which is a direct result of test evaluations (Zeitlin, 1977). Since children do not all mature at the same rate, it is difficult to ascribe the child's problem to a disability or a developmental lag (Lerner, 1971). It is also possible that early identification may influence the teacher's expectancy of the child's capabilities as seen in the self-fulfilling prophecy of Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968). The validity of the

predictive measures is questioned by Keogh and Becker (1973).

The goal of an early screening program is to identify high risk children; to determine the nature of their problem and to make further referrals if necessary thereby attempting to prevent or reduce learning disorders. The screening procedures used in early identification programs are not used as an alternative to in class observations by teachers, but represent a more refined and systematic process of observation (Ebel, 1963).

Teachers believe strongly in the accuracy of their assessment of their students' capabilities (Goslin, 1967) and research has found teacher ratings more effective in predicting learning disabilities (Haring and Ridgway, 1967). Feshback (1974) found that classroom observation could predict first grade success as adequately as diagnostic testing but that the observational method could not provide the prescriptive aspect necessary for remedial work.

In a class of thirty students, the teacher can readily identify the children who are encountering difficulty with the classroom curriculum. A widespread screening program is designed to identify these children before they encounter difficulty with the curriculum, and to recommend a full diagnostic analysis for those who require it. This is usually accompanied by plans for remediation of the child's problems, either within the resources of the school, or in special centers.

In situations in which this type of screening is not commonly practiced, the teacher alone must note the students who are having difficulty and must then depend upon an examiner to assess the specifics of the child's problem and plan a remedial program for the teacher to follow. In this type of

situation it seems that only when the problem becomes urgent is the testing administered, leading the student and the teacher to prolonged periods of frustration .

This study examines teachers in schools in which early screening is not practised and views the teachers as clients requesting and awaiting a service (testing). The hypothesis is that the extent to which the teacher is satisfied with the service will influence the teacher's attitude toward the child and toward the remediation of the child's difficulties. The primary source of the data for this study is a questionnaire survey distributed to 300 teachers in public and private elementary schools in Montreal, Quebec. It should be emphasized that this research falls into the category of an exploratory study as the responses given to the questionnaires are fraught with subjective reactions.

Method

Procedure

The questionnaire was distributed by mail to 100 first grade teachers, 100 kindergarten teachers and a combined group of 100 pre-kindergarten, nursery and day care teachers. The nature of the selection of the respondents was not ordered except for the grade level at which they taught. Their level of training and years of experience were recorded and examined but were not controlled for in this study. The teachers were informed that this survey did not require that they identify themselves beyond their sex, number of years of teaching, grade level at which they were teaching and their last degree.

Subjects

A total of 101 teachers responded to the questionnaire. All respondents were female with an average of 8.5 years of teaching. Fifteen (15.8) per cent of the teachers did not have a degree, forty per cent had a Bachelor of Arts degree, 15.8 per cent had a Bachelor of Education, 10.9 per cent had an undergraduate diploma in Early Childhood Education, 10.9 per cent had an undergraduate diploma in Education and 2 per cent had an Master of Arts degree. The response rate from the first grade teachers was 41 per cent and from the kindergarten teachers was 45 per cent, while the rate for the combined group of pre-kindergarten, nursery and day care was 14 per cent.

Results

The responses of the 101 teachers to the questionnaire indicate that 79 per cent believe that at the preschool level testing beyond the assessments carried out in the classroom is a good idea and 95 per cent have had children in their class whom they believed required this form of individualized testing. In 18 per cent of these cases the child was not tested. The data indicates that in 37.5 per cent of these cases tests were not conducted due to delays and in 31.3 per cent due to parental refusal to have the child tested. Although the sample is small, the reason why the child was not tested is significantly related to the type of school - public vs. private - that the child attended ($\chi^2 = 12.276$; $df = 5$; $p < .05$).

The report from the teachers indicated that in 31.8 per cent of the cases the final decision to test the child rested with the parents, in 18.4 per cent of the cases the principal made the final decision and in 18.4 per cent of the cases the teachers themselves were responsible for the final decision; in only

11.8 per cent of the cases was the final decision made by the principal, teacher and parent in cooperation with one another. Fifty-one (51) per cent of the teachers reported that there was a psychologist on their school staff and 90 per cent stated that they share their psychologists' services with other schools. Twenty-five (25) per cent stated that the school counselor administers the testing.

The most commonly enocuntered problem expressed by the teachers (43 per cent) is the time delay between the request for testing and the actual test administration. The average time that teachers reported waiting for the test administration was 10 weeks. The data revealed that 29.7 per cent of the teachers actually waited three full months for the test to be administered. After the testing was completed, the teachers reported waiting an average of 7 weeks for the test results. Fifty-three (53) per cent of the teachers waited 4 weeks or more for the results. Computation of the average waiting period for the administration of the test plus the average time for the communication of the results brings the average waiting period to 4 months. The data revealed that on the average the teachers suggested that one week was a reasonable period to await a report, and 77.6 per cent stated that they would like the report written within two weeks or less.

In cases where the teacher reported encountering problems before eventually having the child tested, 19 per cent of the time they were told that the child was too young to be tested. Teachers were asked how they worked with the child when they were unable to have the child tested. Thirty-five

(35) per cent reported that they resort to giving the child individual attention; 20 per cent stated that they used behavior modification methods; 15 per cent stated that they tried to understand the causes of the child's problems and 15 per cent answered that they work with the child "the best way they (I) can."

The teachers reported that in only 41.1 per cent of the cases, the psychologist observed the child before administering the test and in only 30 per cent of the cases was a re-evaluation automatically carried out.

The Communication of Test Results

In 83.8 per cent of the cases, the examiner discussed the test results with the teacher and 70 per cent of the teachers received a written report. Sixty-nine (68.9) per cent of the teachers stated that the report required little or no interpretation. While 52.8 per cent of the teachers stated that the relevant issues were assessed by the examiner, 43.1 per cent felt that only some of the relevant issues were assessed.

In response to the question of whether the report supplied the desired information only 49.4 per cent of the teachers stated that it supplied all or most of the desired information. The extent to which the report supplied the desired information is significantly related to the teacher gaining a better understanding of the child's problem ($\chi^2 = 18.161$; df = 4; $p < .001$).

Insert Table 1 about here

Included in the discussion of the communication of test information

at the preschool level must be the parents. The teachers reported that in 76.8 per cent of the cases the results were explained to the parents. In 33.9 per cent of the cases, the teachers reported that they explained the results to the parents while in 30.7 per cent of the cases the psychologist explained the results to the parents.

Insert Table 2 about here

The results being explained to the parents was significantly related to the teachers' perceptions of the degree of ease in working with the child after the test results were known ($p < .01$).

Insert Table 3 about here

The teachers' perception of how receptive the child was after the test results were known is significantly related to the results being explained to the parents ($\chi^2 = 10.173$; $df = 4$; $p < .05$). Eighty-seven (87.5) per cent of the teachers who stated that the results were not explained to the parents felt that the child was not more receptive in the classroom.

Recommendations

The teachers reported that in 61.1 per cent of the cases the examiners report included recommendations for remedial activities. They indicated that in 62.8 per cent of the cases these recommendations were not practical

for classroom use, and that in 75.8 per cent of the cases, recommendations were made for special services beyond what is provided in the classroom. Recommendations for special remedial services is significantly related to the teacher's rating of the degree of hope for the remediation of the child's difficulties ($\chi^2 = 11.975$; df = 4; $p < .01$).

Insert Table 4 about here

Fifty-six (56.3) per cent of the teachers who said that the child was recommended for special remedial services were hopeful of remediation. The extent to which the recommendations were practical for classroom use was significantly related to the extent to which the teacher changed his/her style of working with the child ($p < .05$). Fifty-two (52) per cent of the teachers who reported that the recommendations were impractical for classroom use said that their work with the child changed only somewhat.

Benefits from the testing situation

Only 27.6 per cent of the teachers stated that the report of the test results helped them to deal more effectively with the child, while 26.3 per cent stated that it did not help them. The extent to which the report supplied the desired information was significantly related to the degree to which the teachers felt they were helped to cope more effectively with the child ($\chi^2 = 42.342$; df = 16; $p < .001$). The helpfulness of the discussion was significantly related to the teacher's perception of being helped to cope with the child ($\chi^2 = 13.097$; df = 4; $p < .01$). The extent to which the relevant issues were assessed was significantly related to the teacher's

perception of being helped to cope more effectively with the child (χ^2 = 37.599; df = 16; p <.001). Forty-five (45) per cent of the teachers who reported that the examiner assessed all of the relevant issues stated that they were helped to cope more effectively with the child.

Sixty-two (62.5) per cent of the teachers reported that they gained a better understanding of the child's needs from the test reports. Gaining a better understanding of the child's needs is significantly related to the helpfulness of the discussion with the examiner.

Insert Table 5 about here

Seventy-four (74) per cent of the teachers who stated that the discussion was helpful reported that they gained a better understanding of the child's needs and 75 per cent who reported that the discussion was not helpful said that they did not gain a better understanding of the child's needs.

In the teachers response to the question of whether knowledge of test results made them more or less hopeful of remediation of the child's problem, 29 per cent were more hopeful, while only 16.3 per cent were less hopeful.

Insert Table 6 about here

Hope for remediation is significantly related to the helpfulness of the discussion of the test results (χ^2 = 15.073; df = 4; p <.004). Ninety-

three (93) per cent of the teachers who were more hopeful of remediation stated that the discussion of the test results was helpful, while 60 per cent of those who were less hopeful of remediation stated that discussion of the test results was not helpful.

The teacher's hope for remediation of the child's problems is significantly related to the recommendation for special remedial services ($\chi^2 = 11.975$, df = 4; $p < .01$). Sixty-eight (68) per cent of the teachers who said that they were more hopeful of remediation stated that the child was recommended for special remedial services.

Teacher Perceptions

In response to the question as to whether, after the test results were presented, the child was easier to work with, more difficult to work with or the same as before the testing, 38.2 per cent said the child was easier to work with and 60.5 per cent said the child was the same as before the testing.

Ease of working with the child after the test results are known is significantly related to the helpfulness of the discussion of the test results with the examiner.

Insert Table 7 about here

The ease of working with the child after the test results are known is significantly related to the extent to which the report from the examiner was beneficial ($\chi^2 = 25.313$; df = 8; $p < .001$). Fifty-eight (58.3) per cent of the teachers who stated that the report was beneficial said that the child

was easier to work with after the test results were known. The degree of ease of working with the child after the test results were known is significantly related to the degree to which the report supplied the teacher with the desired information ($\chi^2 = 16.105$; df = 8; $p < .05$). Sixty-three (63.6) per cent of the teachers who stated that the report supplied most of the information desired found that the child was easier to work with.

In response to whether the child was more receptive to the teachers efforts after the test results were known, 28.4 per cent of the teachers answered that the child was somewhat more receptive and 54.1 per cent stated that the child was more receptive.

The teachers were asked if the child's behavior seemed to change after the test results were known and 56.6 per cent indicated that the child's behavior did not change, while 30.3 stated it did, within the response range of "yes" to "somewhat" - 30.3 per cent responded positively. Teachers were asked if their way of working with the child changed after receiving the examiners' report. Twenty-one (21.9) per cent of the teachers said that it did. In the range between "yes" and "somewhat" 30.1 per cent stated that their way of working changed, and 17.8 per cent stated that it did not change.

Changing the way of working with the child is significantly related to the helpfulness of the discussion about the test results ($\chi^2 = 20.288$; df = 4; $p < .001$). Sixty-two (62.5) per cent of the teachers who stated that the discussion was not helpful stated that they had not changed their way of working with the child.

In response to the question as to whether the teacher considered the testing to be beneficial, 26.0 per cent stated that it was in all cases; 31.5

per cent stated that it was in 75 per cent of the cases and 21.9 per cent stated that it was in 50 per cent of the cases. The data indicates that explaining the results to the parents is significantly related to the teachers perception of the testing being beneficial ($\chi^2 = 13.273$; $df = 4$; $p < .01$). Seventy-two (72) per cent of the teachers who stated that the results were explained to the parents reported that testing is beneficial in 75 - 100 per cent of all cases.

Teacher Suggestions

Teachers were asked to relate the type of information which they sought from the testing situation.

Insert Table 8 about here

Sixty (60) per cent of the teachers sought information about how to work with the child, and 38.2 per cent wanted to know the nature of the child's problem. Only 3 per cent were interested in an I.Q. score.

The teachers were asked their opinion as to the best method for imparting information to the teachers about test results.

Insert Table 9 about here

Thirty-two (32) per cent of the teachers believe that a discussion and interview which includes the psychologist, the teacher, and the parents is the best method. Thirty-two (32) per cent believe that both a written and verbal report would be the best method.

Teachers were asked how they moght improve the test situation. Twenty-

seven (27) suggestions were tabulated and those with the greater per cent of consensus of response are presented in tabular form in Table 10.

Discussion

The low rate of response from the combined group of pre-kindergarten, nursery and day care teachers would seem to indicate that little testing is carried out at that level, and it is at this level that the early screening and identification of problems would be most helpful. The child's kindergarten teacher, having been supplied with information about the child's strengths and weaknesses, would be able to prepare a curriculum in which the child would encounter success and be further motivated to achieve success.

In situations where the teacher requested testing but was unable to have the child tested, they indicated that they resorted to modification of the child's behavior rather than dealing with the remediation of the child's problem.

The teachers complaints about the delays between the request for testing and the actual test administration is justified. In many cases, by the time the child is tested half of the school year is over. The teachers also reported waiting an average of two months for the test results which means that they are effectively without the help they requested for three-quarters of the school year. Children should be tested within two weeks of the request and the report ought to be submitted within a week of the test. Professionally it is more accurate and expedient to write a report of the test results within two days of the testing while it is still fresh in one's mind. If one could reduce the teacher's waiting period from four months to three weeks then the child could be helped early in the year, making the learning experience relevant to the child's needs.

The results of this study indicate that when the report from the examiner addresses itself to the information which the teacher was seeking, the teachers stated that they gained a better understanding of the child's needs. Increased communication between the examiner and the teacher prior to the test administration would increase the likelihood that the examiner would be more cognizant of the type of information the teacher was seeking. The data from this study indicates that the psychologists consulted the teachers only 67 per cent of the time prior to the administration of the test.

In order for the testing to be of any consequence, teachers must be informed of the test results, but in our study, in 17 per cent of the cases, the psychologist did not discuss the test results with the teacher and in 27 per cent of the cases the teachers did not receive a written report.

One of the most interesting findings of this study is the teachers' perceptions of the children when the test results have been explained to the parents. They reported that the child was more receptive and easier to work with when the test results had been explained to the parents.

Dissemination of the test results to the parents is a controversial issue. Many testers believe that if lay people are given scores, that they will misuse these scores and will injure a student's self-esteem rather than contribute to his learning (Ebel, 1966). For this reason a shroud of secrecy has been created by the test designer and examiner around the tests and scores, making the public all the more ill-at-ease. Research conducted by Goslin (1967) indicated that 61 per cent of the parents of elementary school students indicated that they would like to have intelligence test information reported routinely by the school while

only 2 per cent of the parents felt that the school should keep this information confidential. The data in our study seems to indicate that contrary to the beliefs held by test writers and examiners, parental knowledge of test results tends to have a positive rather than negative effect on the children.

The teachers reported that in 62.8 per cent of the cases, the recommendations made by the examiner were not practical for use in a classroom and this had a significant effect on the extent to which the teacher altered his/her style of working with the child. Perhaps in-class observations prior to the test administration would help the examiner make appropriate recommendations for use in a classroom with an average of 30 students.

As one might expect, the teachers reported that when the discussion of the test results with the examiner was helpful, they were able to cope more effectively with the child. Our data shows that the helpfulness of the discussion is significantly related to the teachers gaining a better understanding of the child's needs. Once the teacher has a better understanding he/she can cope more effectively with the child by providing work which enhances the child's strengths and minimizes the weaknesses.

The teachers reported that when the discussion with the examiner was helpful they were more hopeful of the remediation of the child's problems and that when recommendations were made for special remedial services, they were more hopeful of remediation. Perhaps if the examiners recommendations for remedial work were more applicable to the classroom there would be less reliance on special services outside of the school.

The majority of the teachers reported that the child was no easier to work with after the administration of the test, because the test itself did not alter the child's problems, but the data did show that a change in the teacher's way of working with the child after the test results were communicated was significantly related to whether the discussion of the results was helpful. The teachers indicated that they preferred both verbal and written reports from the examiner and with equal frequency they stated that they wanted a personal interview and discussion of the results with the examiner as well as a written report for further reference. The teachers requested personal interviews in order for most of their questions and concerns to be dealt with and they wanted the written report for future reference and guidance in working on their own in the classroom.

The teachers' answers to the request for suggestions as to how to improve the test situation were quite interesting. For the most part, they wanted fewer delays in the administration and report of test results and they wanted more follow-up evaluations, with provisions made for special remedial programs when the need was evident. They also saw the need for parent and teacher involvement before and after the test administration.

The results of the study indicate that teacher attitude is influenced by the degree of satisfaction with the testing service, and that the present system of test administration and reporting of results leaves much to be desired. Early screening and identification of preschoolers' difficulties may be a viable solution to this problem.

Table 1.

Teachers reports of gaining a better understanding of the child's needs by the examiners report supplying desired information (Percentages).

Gained Better Understanding	Report Supplied Desired Information				
	All	Most	Some	Very Little	None
Yes	73.3	86.4	64.8	28.6	0
No	26.7	13.6	35.3	71.4	100

$\chi^2 = 18.161$; $df = 4$; $p < .001$

Table 2.

Respnses of Teachers to "Who explained test results to parents?" (Percentages).

Titles	Frequency (PCT)
Psychologist	30.7
Principal	5.0
Psychologist & Principal	5.9
Guidance Counselor	1.0
Free Flow Teacher	1.0

Table 3.

Teachers' responses to working with the child after test results were communicated by the results being explained to the parents. (Percentages).

Rating	Results explained to Parents	
	Yes	No
Easier	51.0	6.3
Same	47.1	93.8
More difficult	2.0	0

$\chi^2 = 10.922$; $df = 2$; $p < .01$

Table 4.

Teachers responses to recommendations for special remedial services by hopefulness of remediation. (Percentages).

Services Recommended	Hope for Remediation Scale (1-5)				
	Most 1	2	3	4	5 Least
YES	22.9	8.3	56.3	10.4	2.1
NO	33.3	6.7	33.3	0	26.7

$\chi^2 = 11.975$; df = 4; $p < .01$

Table 5.

Teachers responses to gained better understanding of child's needs by the helpfulness of the discussion with examiner. (Percentages).

Gained Better Understanding	Discussion Helpful	
	Yes	No
Yes	74.1	25.0
No	24.1	75.0

$\chi^2 = 8.522$; $df = 2$; $p < .01$

Table 6

Teacher responses to the question "Did knowledge of the test results make you more or less hopeful of remediation?". (Percentages).

Scale (1-5)	Frequency (PCT)
1. More hopeful	21.6
2.	8.1
3. Hopeful	54.1
4.	6.8
5. Less hopeful	9.5

Table 7.

Teacher responses to working with the child after test results were communicated by the helpfulness of the discussion of results with the examiner . (Percentages).

Rating	Discussion Helpful	
	Yes	No
Easier	47.3	11.1
Same	52.7	77.8
More difficult	0	11.1

$\chi^2 = 9.371$; $df = 2$; $p < .01$

Table 8.

Teacher respnses to the question "What type of information were you seeking (in test results)?" (Percentages).

Information Sought	Frequency (PCT)
Nature of the Problem	38.2
How to work with child	60.2
Feelings of the Child	4.4
I.Q. score	2.9
Confirmation of teachers own assessment	14.7
Placement in Special Classes	10.3

The teachers listed up to three responses; consequently the percentage does not add to 100.

Table 9.

Teacher responses to the question "What is the best method for imparting information about test results to teachers?" (Percentages).

Method of Imparting Information	Frequency (PCT)
Verbal	16.2
Written	2.7
Verbal and Written	32.4
Steady Consultation and follow up.	5.4
Joint Discussion with psychologist, teacher and parents.	32.4
Interview with psychologist with written report for future use.	14.9

Table 10.

Teacher responses to the question "How might the testing situation be improved?" (Percentages).

Suggestions	Frequency (PCT)
Delays - elimination of	28.0
Follow up evaluation and remediation.	22.8
Involvement of teacher and parent before and after testing.	15.8
More psychologists	12.3
Inform parents of test results.	7.0
Inform teachers of test results.	7.0
More psychologists trained to test youngchildren.	7.0

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anastasi, Anne: Psychological Testing. New York, The MacMillan Company, 1968.

Anastasi, Anne: Testing Problems in Perspective. Washington D.C., American Council on Education, 1966.

Brim, Orville, Neulinger J., Glass, D., Experiences and Attitudes of American Adults Concerning Standardized Intelligence Tests. New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1965.

Buktenica, N.: Identification of Potential Learning Disorders. Journal of Learning Disabilities 4, 7: 379-383, Sept. 1971.

Crombag Hans and De Gruijter, D. (eds.): Contemporary Issues in Educational Testing. The Hague Mouton and Co., 1974.

De Hirsch,K., Janshy, J., and Larford, W.: Predicting Reading Failure. New York, Harper and Row Publishers, 1965.

Denhoff, E., Hainsworth, P., and Hainsworth, M.: Learning Disabilities and early childhood education: An information processing approach. In Myklebust, H. (Ed.): Progress in Learning Disabilities, Vol. II New York, Grune, 1971.

Ebel, Robert L.: The Social Consequences of Educational Testing. In Testing Problems in Perspective, Washington D.C., American Council on Education, 1966.

Feshback,Seymour, Adelman, Howard and Fuller, Williamson: Early Identification of Children with High Risk of Reading Failure. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 7: 639-44, Dec. 1974.

Goslin, David A.: Teachers and Testing. New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1967.

Goslin, David A.: The School in Contemporary Society. Illinois Scott Foresman and Co., 1965.

Goslin, D.A., Epstein, R., Hallock, B.A.: The Use of Standardized Tests in Elementary Schools. New York, Russell Sage Foundation 1965.

Haring, N.G., and Ridgway, R.W.: Early Identification of Children with Learning Disability. Exceptional Child, 33: 387-95, 1967.

Horrocks, John, and Schoonover Thelma: Measurement for Teachers. Columbus Ohio, Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1968.

Koegh, Barbara, ed.: Early Identification of Children with Potential Learning Problems. Journal of Special Education 4,3: 309-363. Fall 1970.

Koegh, B., and Becher, L.: Early detection of Learning Problems: Questions, Cautions and Guidelines. Exceptional Children 40: 5-11, Sept. 1973.

Lerner, Janet W., : Children with Learning Disabilities. Boston Houghton Mifflin Company, 1976.

Rosenshine, Barah: Teaching Behaviors and Student Achievement. England, National Foundation for Educational Research, 1971.

Rosenthal, R. and Jacobson, L.: Pygmalion in the Classroom. New York, Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Thorndike, Robert, and Hagen, E.: Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education. New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1961.

Zeitlin, Shirley: Kindergarten Screening. Illinois Charles C. Thomas Publisher, 1976.

FORM A

QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS: Please put check mark beside the appropriate answer. Where there is a range of 1 to 5 please circle the number which is most representative of your answer.

OFFICE USE ONLY:	OFFICE USE ONLY
1. Code	___ 1-3
2. Card Number	___ 4
3. Male ___ Female ___	___ 5
4. Number of years of teaching experience ___	___ 6-7
5. At what level are you presently teaching? Day Care ___ Nursery ___ Prekindergarten ___ Kindergarten ___ Grade 1___	___ 8
6. What was your last degree? _____	___ 9
7. Is the school in which you are teaching public ___ or private ___ ?	___ 10
8. Is there a psychologist on staff? YES ___ NO ___	___ 11
9. Do you share this psychologist's services with other schools? YES ___ NO ___	___ 12
10. If a psychologist is not on staff or associated with the school, does someone other than a psychologist test children in your school? YES ___ NO ___	___ 13
11. If YES, who tests these children? _____	___ 14
12. Have you had a child or children in your class whom you believed required testing beyond the normal classroom testing? YES ___ NO ___	___ 15
13. If YES, was the child tested? YES ___ NO ___	___ 16
14. If NO to question # 13, why was the child not tested? _____	___ 17-20
_____	
_____	
15. In your opinion, is testing a good idea at the preschool level? YES ___ NO ___	___ 21

PLEASE NOTE: If you answered NO to questions #13 or #12, please continue onto Form B and disregard Form A.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

16. The final decision to test the child was made by:
    a) parents_____ b) administrator/principal _____
    c) teacher _____ d) social worker _____
    e) psychologist _____ f) other (specify) _____ ___ 22

17. Did you encounter any problems having the child tested?
    YES ___ NO ___ ___ 23

18. If YES, please describe: _____
    _____ ___

19. Were you consulted by the psychologist before the testing began? YES ___ NO ___ ___ 24

20. Did the psychologist observe the child in the classroom before the testing began? YES ___ NO ___ ___ 25

21. Were you consulted by the psychologist after the testing was completed? YES ___ NO ___ ___ 26

22. Approximately how much time elapsed between your request for testing and the actual testing? _____ |___|___| 27-28

23. Did the examiner discuss the test results with you?
    YES ___ NO ___ ___ 29

24. If YES, was this discussion helpful? YES ___ NO ___ ___ 30

25. If NO, why not? _____
    _____

26. Did you receive a written report? YES ___ NO ___ ___ 31

27. Was the report clear and concise? YES ___ NO ___ ___ 32

28. Was the report written in a manner which required interpretion?
    1 No interpretation needed — 2 — 3 Some needed — 4 — 5 All of it required interpretation

29. If you circled #3, #4, #5 in question #28 was the report subsequently interpreted for you? YES ___ NO ___ ___ 33

30. Do you believe that the examiner assessed the relevant issues?
    1 All of the issues — 2 — 3 some of the issues — 4 — 5 none of the issues ___ 34

OFFICE USE ONLY

31. In the report was mention made of the problems which first led you to request the test? YES ___ NO ___ ___ 35

32. How long after the testing was completed were you given the written report? _____ ___ 36-37

33. How soon after the testing would you have liked to receive the report? _____ ___ 38-39

34. Did you find that the verbal and/or written report were/was beneficial in treating the child's problems?

1 Very | 2 | 3 Moderately | 4 | 5 Not at all ___ 40

35. Did the report supply you with the information you were seeking?

1 Yes | 2 Most of what I needed | 3 A little | 4 Very little | 5 No ___ 41

36. What type of information were you seeking? Discuss:

_____

_____

37. Were recommendations for specific remedial activities included in the report? YES ____ NO ____ ___ 42

38. Were these recommendations practical for a classroom situation? YES ___ NO ____ ___ 43

39. Did the recommendations call for special services beyond what is provided in the classroom? YES ___ NO _____ ___ 44

40. Did the test results provide you with new insights into the child's problems?

1 Yes | 2 | 3 Somewhat | 4 | 5 No ___ 45

41. Did you gain a better understanding of the child's needs? YES ____ NO _____ ___ 46

42. Did the report/testing help you cope with the child in a more effective manner?

1 Yes | 2 | 3 Somewhat | 4 | 5 No ___ 47

43. Did you find that after the test results were presented to you that the child was: (check appropriate answer)
easier to work with _____
more difficult to work with _____
the same as before the testing _____ ___ 48

OFFICE USE ONLY

44. Why?

_____ ___ 49

_____

45. Did the child's behavior seem to change after the tests were known?

1 2 3 4 5 ___ 50

Yes Somewhat No

46. Did you perceive the child to be more receptive to your efforts after the test results were known?

1 2 3 4 5 ___ 51

Yes Somewhat No

47. Did knowledge of the results make you more or less hopeful of remediation of the problem?

1 2 3 4 5 ___ 52

More hopeful hopeful less hopeful

48. Did your way of working with the child change after the receipt of the examiner's report?

1 2 3 4 5 ___ 53

Yes Somewhat No

49. Do you believe that testing was beneficial for the children who were evaluated?

In all cases _____ In 75% of cases _____ ___ 54

In 50% of cases _____ In 25% of cases _____

In 10% or less of cases _____

50. In your opinion what is the best method for imparting information about test results to teachers?

_____

_____

_____

51. Were the test results explained to the parents?

YES ___ NO ___ ___ 55

52. If YES, were you called upon to explain the results?

YES ___ NO ___ ___ 56

53. If NO, who explained the results? _____ |__|__| 57-58

OFFICE USE ONLY

54. After the test was completed and the results were known, were the child's parents
easier to work with _____
harder to work with _____
same as before (qualify) _____
_____

59-60

55. Was a follow-up evaluation of the child done automatically?
YES ___ NO ___

61

56. Did you request a follow-up evaluation? YES ___ NO ___

62

57. Please give suggestions as to how the testing situation might be improved?

_____
_____
_____
_____

Card no. 1 80

THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND EFFORT, WHICH ARE TRULY APPRECIATED.

FORM B

QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS: If you answered NO to questions #13 or #12 please complete this form, and disregard the remainder of Form A.

OFFICE USE ONLY

16. In your opinion does testing help the teacher in his/her work with a child who is having problems in the classroom? YES ___ NO_____ ___ 23

17. How do you think that test results might have helped you with the child if he had been tested? _____

_____

_____

18. Would you prefer to have the examiner speak to you
    a) before the testing began? _____
    b) after it was completed? _____
    c) both? _____ ___ 24

19. Would you prefer to have from the examiner
    a) a written report? _____
    b) a verbal report? _____
    c) both? _____ ___ 25

20. What type of information would you expect the examiner to provide you with? _____

_____

_____

21. Would you expect the examiner to outline a program of remedial work? YES ____ NO ____ ___ 26

22. Do you believe that after receiving test results the child would be
    a) easier to work with? _____
    b) more difficult to work with? _____
    c) same as before testing? _____ ___ 27

23. Why? _____

_____

_____

OFFICE USE ONLY

24. Have other teachers you have known found that the testing of children in their classes was helpful?
YES ____ NO ____ ___28

25. In what way were the results helpful? _____

_____

_____

26. Why? _____

_____

27. When you are unable to have a child tested describe how you work with such a child: _____

_____

_____

28. How do you feel towards having children tested?
Positive _____ Negative _____ Neutral_____ ___ 29

THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND EFFORT, WHICH ARE TRULY APPRECIATED.